

C. Remarks

The claims are 1-22, with claims 1 and 12 being independent. Claims 2-4, 6, 13-15 and 17 have been withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner. Claims 1, 5, 7-12, 16 and 18-22 have been amended to clarify the invention. In particular, each of the independent claims has been amended to set forth that the printing conditions are previously determined and that the judging means judges with which printing condition the printing should be performed in accordance. The remaining amendments are formal in nature. Applicants submit that the amendments are fully supported by the application as filed and that no new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the present claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 5, 7-12, 16 and 18-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Helterline. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Helterline discloses a configuration which makes adjustments in the amount of ejected ink. Figure 1 therein shows that lines 14, 16 are printed using nozzles of an ink jet head and that the widths of the lines 14, 16 are measured by a sensor 18. Then, measured widths of lines 14, 16 are compared with a predetermined width, and the amount of ejected ink is adjusted based on the result of the comparison. More specifically, a signal 44 as output from the sensor and a signal corresponding to the predetermined width are compared, and a driving signal is determined based on the comparison result using a look-up table 52. Helterline addresses the problem encountered when the size of a dot varies with the type of printing medium and, as a result, printing with an intended resolution can not be achieved. Accordingly, in Helterline, the amount of ejected ink is adjusted so that the width of a line formed by ink dots becomes the predetermined width.

By contrast, the present invention addresses the problem encountered when there are differences in densities of printed images depending upon the type of printed image, whereby an effect of correcting density may not be sufficiently obtained. According to the present invention, a print condition when an image is printed is judged and a correction of density is changed accordingly. This is clearly different from the disclosure of Helterline, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the §102 rejection.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, favorable reconsideration and passage to issue of the present case is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe that issues remain outstanding, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney in an effort to resolve such issues and advance the case to issue.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Elizabeth F. Holowacz/
Elizabeth F. Holowacz
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 42,667

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200